

CASE NO.: 50P4257.05

Serial No.: 09/972,183

May 22, 2005

Page 4

PATENT

Filed: October 5, 2001


**Remarks**

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kawashima, USPN 6,804,730 in view of Phillips, USPN 6,684,084, and now-canceled Claim 28 had been rejected as being obvious over the above references in view of Durrett, USPN 5,964,084. The limitation of Claim 28 now appears in Claims 26 and 27.

Accordingly, at issue is the former rejection of Claim 28, which is based on an incorrect understanding of Durrett. Contrary to what is alleged in the Office Action, Durrett does not deactivate anything if the user ID is not known to the virtual disk server. Instead, the server merely disconnects, col. 7, lines 60-62. The same operation occurs if the password check fails, col. 8, lines 1-3. In both cases, the local computer 10 remains activated. For this reason, even if the references were combined as proposed the present claims would not result.

Additionally, Claims 26 and 27 do not merely recite "deactivating" something in a vacuum. They explicitly require deactivating the wireless module that is used with the peripheral device. Durrett, in contrast, merely disconnects a still-active local computer 10 from a server without giving any hint whatsoever about doing something to a wireless module that might be associated with the local computer 10, much less does Durrett motivate the specific action related to the wireless module that is now recited in the claims.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz  
Registration No. 33,549  
Attorney of Record  
750 B Street, Suite 3120  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-107.AM3